


EDEN



Eden Environmental Citizen's Group

June 14, 2019

Via US Mail, Certified

Dave Sykes
City Manager
City of San Jose
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San José, CA 95113

Facility Manager
American Custom Marble, Inc.
806 West Home Street
San Jose, CA 95126

Via US Mail

Patricia A. Sharp
Agent for service
American Custom Marble, Inc.
3483 Speno Road
San Jose, CA 95117

Richard Doyle
City Attorney
200 E. Santa Clara St.
San José, CA 95113

**Re: FIRST AMENDED 60-Day Notice of Violations and Intent to File Suit Under the
Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act")**

To Officers, Directors, Operators, Property Owners and/or Facility Managers of American
Custom Marble, Inc.:



I am writing on behalf of Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN") to give legal notice that EDEN intends to file a civil action against American Custom Marble, Inc. ("American Custom Marble") and the property owner, the City of San Jose, for violations of the Federal Clean Water Act ("CWA" or "Act") 33 U.S.C. § 1251 *et seq.*, that EDEN believes are occurring at the American Custom Marble, Inc. facility located at 806 West Home Street in San Jose, California ("the Facility" or "the site"). **This Notice amends the Notice of Intent to Sue previously issued by EDEN to American Custom Marble on March 15, 2019.**

EDEN is an environmental citizen's group established under the laws of the State of California to protect, enhance, and assist in the restoration of all rivers, creeks, streams, wetlands, vernal pools, and tributaries of California, for the benefit of its ecosystems and communities.

CWA section 505(b) requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under CWA section 505(a), a citizen must give notice of intent to file suit. 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b). Notice must be given to the alleged violator, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and the State in which the violations occur.

As required by CWA section 505(b), this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit provides notice to the Discharger of the violations which have occurred and continue to occur at the Facility. After the expiration of sixty (60) days from the date of this Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit, EDEN intends to file suit in federal court against the Discharger under CWA section 505(a) for the violations described more fully below.

I. THE SPECIFIC STANDARD, LIMITATION, OR ORDER VIOLATED

EDEN's investigation of the Facility has uncovered significant, ongoing, and continuous violations of the CWA and the General Industrial Storm Water Permit issued by the State of California (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000001 [State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB")] Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 97-03-DWQ ("1997 Permit") and by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ ("2015 Permit") (collectively, the "General Permit").

Information available to EDEN, including documents obtained from California EPA's online Storm Water Multiple Application and Reporting Tracking System ("SMARTS"), indicates that on or around August 25, 2017, American Custom Marble, Inc. submitted a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to be authorized to discharge storm water from the Facility under the 2015 Permit. American Custom Marble, Inc.'s assigned Waste Discharger Identification number ("WDID") is 2 43I027321.

As more fully described in Section III, below, EDEN alleges that in its operations of the Facility, the Discharger has committed ongoing violations of the substantive and procedural requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act, California Water Code §13377; the General Permit,

the Regional Water Board Basin Plan, the California Toxics Rule (CTR) 40 C.F.R. § 131.38, and California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 64431.

II. THE LOCATION OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

A. The Facility

The location of the point sources from which the pollutants identified in this Notice are discharged in violation of the CWA is American Custom Marble, Inc.'s permanent facility address of 806 West Home Street in San Jose, California.

American Custom Marble, Inc. is a facility in the business of manufacturing, fabricating, and installing kitchen and bath surfaces. Facility operations are covered under Standard Industrial Classification Code (SIC) 2821– Plastics Material and Synthetic Resins, and Non-vulcanizable Elastomers.

Based on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet for Sector C - Chemical and Allied Products Manufacturing and Refining polluted discharges from facilities such as these, contain pH affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, and arsenic; chemical oxygen demand ("COD"); biochemical oxygen demand ("BOD"); total suspended solids ("TSS"); benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; and oil and grease ("O&G"), and all those particular to the facility. Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's industrial activities and associated materials are exposed to storm water, and that each of the substances listed on the EPA's Industrial Storm Water Fact Sheet is a potential source of pollutants at the Facility.

B. The Affected Receiving Waters

The Facility discharges into a municipal storm drain system, which then discharges to the Los Gatos Creek, which then flows to the Guadalupe River, then the Alviso Slough, where it then reaches the San Francisco Bay ("Receiving Waters").

The San Francisco Bay is a water of the United States. The CWA requires that water bodies such as the San Francisco Bay meet water quality objectives that protect specific "beneficial uses." The Regional Water Board has issued the San Francisco Bay *Basin Water Quality Control Plan* ("Basin Plan") to delineate those water quality objectives.

The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters downstream of the Facility include: commercial and sport fishing, estuarine habitat, fish migration, navigation, preservation of rare and endangered

species, water contact and noncontact recreation, shellfish harvesting, fish spawning, and wildlife habitat. Contaminated storm water from the Facility adversely affects the water quality of the San Francisco Bay watershed and threatens the beneficial uses and ecosystem of this watershed.

Furthermore, the San Francisco Bay is listed for water quality impairment on the most recent 303(d)-list for the following: chlordane; dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT); dieldrin; dioxin compounds (including 2,3,7,8- tetrachlorodibenzo-pdioxin); furan compounds; invasive species; mercury; polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); PCBs (dioxin-like); selenium, and trash.

Polluted storm water and non-storm water discharges from industrial facilities, such as the Facility, contribute to the further degradation of already impaired surface waters, and harm aquatic dependent wildlife.

III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND GENERAL PERMIT

A. Late Application for NPDES Coverage

The CWA prohibits storm water discharges without a permit. 33 U.S.C. § 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26. The General Permit regulates operators of facilities subject to coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) storm water permit, as these operators discharge storm water associated with specific industrial activities identified by both industrial activity and SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes in Attachment A of the Permit.

The Discharger's primary industrial activity is listed on Attachment A as an industrial activity subject to NPDES coverage. Thus, the facility was required to apply for coverage under the Permit in order to commence business operations, pursuant to Section I.Q of the Permit.

According to California Secretary of State records, American Custom Marble, Inc. commenced its operations at the site on or before December 23, 1996.

The Discharger did not in fact apply for coverage until August 25, 2017. Thus, between at least December 23, 1996 and August 25, 2017, the Facility operated without NDPEs Permit coverage. During that time, the Facility did not comply with any of the terms of the Permit, including implementing Best Management Practices, collecting and analyzing storm water runoff for pollution parameters, preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, or filing Annual Reports.

Permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act and the Water Code, is grounds for enforcement action against the Facility and is further a violation of Sections I. and II.B.1.b. of the General Permit.

Section II.B.5 provides that “New Dischargers registering for NOI coverage on or after July 1, 2015 shall certify and submit PRDs via SMARTS at least seven (7) days prior to commencement of industrial activities or on July 1, 2015, whichever comes later.”

B. Deficient/Invalid SWPPP or Site Map

The Discharger’s current Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) for the Facility is inadequate and fails to comply with the requirements of the General Permit as specified in Section X of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, as follows:

- (a) The Site Map does not include the minimum required components for Site Maps as indicated in Section X.E of the General Permit. Specifically, the Site Map fails to include the following:
 - 1) notes, legends, and other data to ensure the map is clear, legible and understandable;
 - 2) the facility boundary;
 - 3) storm water drainage areas within the facility boundary and portions of any drainage area impacted by discharges from surrounding areas;
 - 4) the flow direction of each drainage area;
 - 5) on-facility surface water bodies;
 - 6) areas of soil erosion;
 - 7) sample locations if different than the identified discharge locations;
 - 8) locations and descriptions of structural control measures that affect industrial storm water discharges, authorized NSWDS and/or run-on;
 - 9) identification of all impervious areas of the facility, including paved areas, buildings, covered storage areas or other roofed structures;
 - 10) locations where materials are directly exposed to precipitation and the locations where identified significant spills or leaks have occurred;
 - 11) all areas of industrial activity subject to the General Permit.
- (b) The SWPPP fails to discuss in specific detail Facility operations, including its SIC Code and hours of operations (Section X.D.2.d); and not adequately indicate the Facility name and contact information (Section X.A.1);
- (c) The SWPPP fails to include an adequate discussion of the Facility’s receiving waters (Section XI.B.6(e), Section X.G.2.ix)
- (d) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate discussion of the Industrial Materials handled at the facility (Section X.F);

- (e) The SWPPP fails to include an adequate description of Potential Pollutant Sources and narrative assessment of all areas of industrial activity with potential industrial pollutant sources, including Industrial Processes, Material Handling and Storage Areas, Dust and Particulate Generating Activities, Significant Spills and Leaks, Non-Storm Water Discharges and Erodible Surfaces (Section X.G.1);
- (f) The SWPPP fails to include a narrative assessment of all areas of industrial activity with potential industrial pollutant sources, including the areas of the facility with likely sources of pollutants in storm water discharges and the pollutants likely to be present (Section X.G.2);
- (g) The Minimum Best Management Policies (BMPs) as indicated in the SWPPP are insufficient and do not comply with the minimum required categories as listed in the General Permit, which include Good Housekeeping, Preventive Maintenance, Spill and Leak Prevention and Response, Material Handling and Waste Management, Erosion and Sediment Controls, Employee Training Program and Quality Assurance and Record Keeping (Section X.H.1);
- (h) The Advanced BMPs as identified in the SWPPP are inadequate to comply with the Best Available Technology (“BAT”) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (“BCT”) requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in the Facility’s storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability, including Exposure Minimization BMPs, Storm Water Containment and Discharge Reduction BMPs or Treatment Control BMPs (Section X.H.2);
- (i) The SWPPP fails to include a BMP Summary Table summarizing each identified area of industrial activity, the associated industrial pollutant sources, the industrial pollutants and the BMPs being implemented (Section X.H.4 and X.H.5);
- (j) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate Monitoring Implementation Plan, including a discussion of Visual Observations, Sampling and Analysis and Sampling Analysis Reporting (Section XI);
- (k) The SWPPP fails to include an appropriate discussion of drainage areas and Outfalls from which samples must be taken during Qualified Storm Events (Section XI);
- (l) The SWPPP fails to include the appropriate sampling parameters for the Facility (Table 1, Section XI); and

- (m) The SWPPP fails to include in the SWPPP detailed information about its Pollution Prevention Team (Section X.D);
- (n) The SWPPP fails to discuss the Annual Comprehensive Facility Compliance Evaluation (Section X.A.9);
- (o) The SWPPP omits the date that it was initially prepared (Section X.A.10); and
- (p) The SWPPP is invalid because it was not certified and submitted by the Facility's Legally Responsible Person. In fact, the SWPPP was not certified by anyone. Pursuant to Section XII.K of the General Permit, all Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), which includes SWPPPs, must be certified and submitted by a duly authorized Legally Responsible Person;

Failure to develop or implement an adequate SWPPP is a violation of Sections II.B.4.f and X of the General Permit.

C. Failure to Develop, Implement and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the General Permit

Section XI of the General Permit requires Dischargers to develop and implement a storm water monitoring and reporting program ("M&RP") prior to conducting industrial activities. Dischargers have an ongoing obligation to revise the M&RP as necessary to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

The objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the General Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the Facility, and it must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the General Permit.

1. Failure to Conduct Visual Observations

Section XI(A) of the General Permit requires all Dischargers to conduct visual observations at least once each month, and sampling observations at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location.

Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges.

EDEN alleges that between July 1, 2015, and the present, the Discharger has failed to conduct monthly and sampling visual observations pursuant to Section XI(A) of the General Permit.

2. Failure to Collect and Analyze the Required Number of Storm Water Samples

In addition, EDEN alleges that the Discharger has failed to provide the Regional Water Board with the minimum number of annual documented results of facility run-off sampling as required under Sections XI.B.2 and XI.B.11.a of Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ, in violation of the General Permit and the CWA.

Section XI.B.2 of the General Permit requires that all Dischargers collect and analyze storm water samples from two Qualifying Storm Events (“QSEs”) within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31), and two (2) QSEs within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

Section XI.B.3 of the General Permit requires Dischargers who are members of Compliance Groups to collect and analyze storm water samples from one (1) QSE within the first half of each reporting year (July 1 to December 31) and one (1) QSE within the second half of the reporting year (January 1 to June 30).

Section XI.C.6.b provides that if samples are not collected pursuant to the General Permit, an explanation must be included in the Annual Report.

As of the date of this Notice, the Discharger has failed to upload into the SMARTS database system:

- a. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period July 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017;
- b. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period January 1, 2018, through June 30, 2018; and
- c. Two storm water sample analyses for the time period July 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.

D. Falsification of Annual Reports Submitted to the Regional Water Board

Section XXI.L of the General Permit provides as follows:

L. Certification

Any person signing, certifying, and submitting documents under Section XXI.K above shall make the following certification:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all Attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information submitted is, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

Further, Section XXI.N of the General Permit provides as follows:

N. Penalties for Falsification of Reports

Clean Water Act section 309(c)(4) provides that any person that knowingly makes any false material statement, representation, or certification in any record or other document submitted or required to be maintained under this General Permit, including reports of compliance or noncompliance shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years or by both.

On July 12, 2018, American Custom Marble, Inc. submitted its Annual Report for the Fiscal Year 2017-2018. The Report was signed under penalty of law by Ms. Sharp. Ms. Sharp is the currently designated Legally Responsible Person ("LRP") for American Custom Marble, Inc.

Ms. Sharp responded "Yes" to Question No. 3 on the Annual Report ("Did you sample the required number of Qualifying Storm Events during the reporting year for all discharge locations, in accordance with Section XI.B?") However, as discussed above, American Custom Marble, Inc. failed to collect and analyze the required number of storm water samples during the 2017-18 reporting year.

Based on the foregoing, it is clear that Ms. Sharp made a false statement in the Facility's 2017-18 Annual Reports.

E. Deficient BMP Implementation

Sections I.C, V.A and X.C.1.b of the General Permit require Dischargers to identify and implement minimum and advanced Best Management Practices ("BMPs") that comply with the Best Available Technology ("BAT") and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology ("BCT") requirements of the General Permit to reduce or prevent discharges of pollutants in their storm water discharge in a manner that reflects best industry practice, considering technological availability and economic practicability and achievability.

EDEN alleges that American Custom Marble, Inc. has been conducting industrial activities at the site without adequate BMPs to prevent resulting non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from these activities are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in the General Permit, and thus are always prohibited.

American Custom Marble, Inc.'s failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

Failure to Comply with Section XVIII of the General Permit

Specifically, Plastic Package has failed to comply with Section XVIII of the General Permit, which provides as follows:

XVIII. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS - PLASTIC MATERIALS

A. Facilities covered under this General Permit that handle Plastic Materials are required to implement BMPs to eliminate discharges of plastic in storm water in addition to the other requirements of this General Permit that are applicable to all other Industrial Materials and Activities. Plastic Materials are virgin and recycled plastic resin pellets, powders, flakes, powdered additives, regrind, dust, and other similar types of preproduction plastics with the potential to discharge or migrate off-site. Any Dischargers' facility handling Plastic Materials will be referred to as Plastics Facilities in this General Permit. Any Plastics Facility covered under this General Permit that manufactures, transports, stores, or consumes these materials shall submit information to the State Water Board in their PRDs, including the type and form of plastics, and which BMPs are implemented at the facility to prevent illicit discharges. Pursuant to Water Code section 13367, Plastics Facilities are subject to mandatory, minimum BMPs.

1. At a minimum, Plastics Facilities shall implement and include in the SWPPP:

- a. Containment systems at each on-site storm drain discharge location down gradient of areas containing plastic material. The containment system shall be designed to trap all particles retained by a 1mm mesh screen, with a treatment capacity of no less than the peak flow rate from a one-year, one-hour storm.
- b. When a containment system is infeasible, or poses the potential to cause an illicit discharge, the facility may propose a technically feasible alternative BMP or suite of BMPs. The alternative BMPs shall be designed to achieve the same or better performance standard as a 1mm mesh screen with a treatment capacity of the peak flow rate from a one-year, one-hour storm. Alternative BMPs shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board for approval.
- c. Plastics Facilities shall use durable sealed containers designed not to rupture under typical loading and unloading activities at all points of plastic transfer and storage.
- d. Plastics Facilities shall use capture devices as a form of secondary containment during transfers, loading, or unloading Plastic Materials. Examples of capture devices for secondary containment include, but are not limited to catch pans, tarps, berms or any other device that collects errant material.
- e. Plastics Facilities shall have a vacuum or vacuum-type system for quick cleanup of fugitive plastic material available for employees.
- f. Pursuant to Water Code section 13367(e)(1), Plastics Facilities that handle Plastic Materials smaller than 1mm in size shall develop a containment system designed to trap the smallest plastic material handled at the facility with a treatment capacity of at least the peak flow rate from a one-year, one-hour storm, or develop a feasible alternative BMP or suite of BMPs that are designed to achieve a similar or better performance standard that shall be submitted to the Regional Water Board for approval.

2. Plastics Facilities are exempt from the Water Code requirement to install a containment system under section 13367 of the Water Code if they meet one of the following requirements that are determined to be equal to, or exceed the performance requirements of a containment system:

- a. The Discharger has certified and submitted via SMARTS a valid No Exposure Certification (NEC) in accordance with Section XVII; or
- b. Plastics Facilities are exempt from installing a containment system, if the following suite of eight (8) BMPs is implemented. This combination of BMPs is considered to reduce or prevent the discharge of plastics at a performance level equivalent to or better than the 1mm mesh and flow standard in Water Code section 13367(e)(1).
 - i. Plastics Facilities shall annually train employees handling Plastic Materials. Training shall include environmental hazards of plastic discharges, employee responsibility for corrective actions to prevent errant Plastic Materials, and standard procedures for containing, cleaning, and disposing of errant Plastic Materials.
 - ii. Plastics Facilities shall immediately fix any Plastic Materials containers that are punctured or leaking and shall clean up any errant material in a timely manner.
 - iii. Plastics Facilities shall manage outdoor waste disposal of Plastic Materials in a manner that prevents the materials from leaking from waste disposal containers or during waste hauling.
 - iv. Plastics Facilities that operate outdoor conveyance systems for Plastic Materials shall maintain the system in good operating condition. The system shall be sealed or filtered in such a way as to prevent the escape of materials when in operation. When not in operation, all connection points shall be sealed, capped, or filtered so as to not allow material to escape. Employees operating the conveyance system shall be trained how to operate in a manner that prevents the loss of materials such as secondary containment, immediate spill response, and checks to ensure the system is empty during connection changes.
 - v. Plastics Facilities that maintain outdoor storage of Plastic Materials shall do so in a durable, permanent structure that prevents exposure to weather that could cause the material to migrate or discharge in storm water.
 - vi. Plastics Facilities shall maintain a schedule for regular housekeeping and routine inspection for errant Plastic Materials. The Plastics Facility shall ensure that their employees follow the schedule.
 - vii. PRDs shall include the housekeeping and routine inspection schedule, spill response and prevention procedures, and employee training materials regarding plastic material handling.
 - viii. Plastics Facilities shall correct any deficiencies in the employment of the above BMPs that result in errant Plastic Materials that may discharge or migrate off-site in a timely manner. Any Plastic Materials that are discharged or that migrate off-site constitute an illicit discharge in violation of this General Permit.

F. Discharges in Violation of the General Permit

Except as authorized by Special Conditions of the General Permit, Discharge Prohibition III(B) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. Unauthorized non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit.

Information available to EDEN indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges.

EDEN alleges that the Discharger has discharged storm water containing excessive levels of pollutants from the Facility to its Receiving Waters during at least every significant local rain event over 0.1 inches in the last five (5) years.

EDEN hereby puts the Discharger on notice that each time the Facility discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition III.B of the General Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the General Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a).

1. Discharges in Excess of Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

The Industrial General Permit includes technology-based effluent limitations, which prohibit the discharge of pollutants from the Facility in concentrations above the level commensurate with the application of best available technology economically achievable (“BAT”) for toxic pollutants and best conventional pollutant control technology (“BCT”) for conventional pollutants. (General Permit, Section X.H.)

The EPA has published Benchmark values set at the maximum pollutant concentration levels present if an industrial facility is employing BAT and BCT, as listed in Table 2 of the General Permit. The General Permit includes “Numeric Action Levels” (“NALs”) derived from these Benchmark values; however, the NALs do not represent technology-based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has implemented BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT. (General Permit, Section I.M. (Finding 62)).

American Custom Marble, Inc.’s exceedances of Benchmark values identified in the table listed below, indicate that it has failed and is failing to employ measures that constitute BAT and BCT, in violation of the requirements of the Industrial General Permit. EDEN alleges and notifies American Custom Marble, Inc. that its storm water discharges from the Facility have consistently contained and continue to contain levels of pollutants that exceed Benchmark values as listed below.

These allegations are based on the Facility’s self-reported data submitted to the Regional Water Board. Self-monitoring reports under the Permit are deemed “conclusive evidence of an exceedance of a permit limitation.” *Sierra Club v. Union Oil*, 813 F.2d 1480, 1492 (9th Cir. 1988).

The Discharger’s ongoing discharges of storm water containing levels of pollutants above EPA Benchmark values and BAT- and BCT-based levels of control also demonstrate that it has not developed and implemented sufficient BMPs at the Facility. EPA Benchmarks are relevant to the inquiry as to whether a facility has implemented BMPs. [*Cal. Sportfishing Prot. Alliance v. River City Waste Recyclers, LLC* (E.D.Cal. 2016) 205 F.Supp.3d 1128; *Baykeeper v. Kramer Metals, Inc.* (C.D.Cal. 2009) 619 F.Supp.2d 914, 925; *Waterkeepers Northern California v. AG Industrial Mfg. Inc.* (9th Cir. 2004) 375 F.3d 913, 919 (concentration levels in excess of EPA benchmarks are evidence supporting the citizen plaintiff’s contention that defendant did not have appropriate BMPs to achieve BAT/BCT).]

American Custom Marble, Inc.'s failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs and pollution controls to meet BAT and BCT at the Facility violates and will continue to violate the CWA and the Industrial General Permit each day the Facility discharges storm water without meeting BAT and BCT.

2. Discharges in Excess of Receiving Water Limitations

In addition to employing technology based effluent limitations, the Industrial General Permit requires dischargers to comply with Receiving Water Limitations. Receiving Water Limitation found in Section VI(B) of the General Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface water that adversely impact human health or the environment.

Discharges that contain pollutants in concentrations that exceed levels known to adversely impact aquatic species and the environment also constitute violations of the General Permit Receiving Water Limitation.

Applicable Water Quality Standards ("WQS") are set forth in the California Toxics Rule ("CTR") and the Regional Basin Plan. Exceedances of WQS are violations of the Industrial General Permit, the CTR, and the Basin Plan. Industrial storm water discharges must strictly comply with WQS, including those criteria listed in the applicable Basin Plan. (See *Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1166-67 (9th Cir. 1999).)

The Basin Plan establishes WQS for the San Francisco Bay and its tributaries, including but not limited to the following:

- Waters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Waters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are lethal to or that produce other detrimental responses in aquatic organisms.
- Surface waters shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in amounts that adversely affect any designated beneficial use.

Information available to EDEN indicates that the Facility's storm water discharges

contain elevated concentrations of specific pollutants, such as pH and metals. These polluted discharges can be acutely toxic and/or have sub-lethal impacts on the avian and aquatic wildlife in the Receiving Waters. Discharges of elevated concentrations of pollutants in the storm water from the Facility also adversely impact human health. These harmful discharges from the Facility are violations of the General Permit Receiving Water Limitation.

Further, EDEN puts the Discharger on notice that the Receiving Water Limitations are independent requirements that must be complied with, and that carrying out the process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the General Permit does not amount to compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. The NALs do not represent water quality-based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has caused or contributed to an exceedance of a WQS, or whether it is causing adverse impacts to human health or the environment.

Section XX.B. of the General Permit provides that when a facility's industrial storm water discharges and/or authorized NSWDS are determined to contain pollutants that are in violation of Receiving Water Limitations contained in Section VI, the Discharger must conduct a facility evaluation to identify pollutant source(s) within the facility that are associated with industrial activity and whether the BMPs described in the SWPPP have been properly implemented, assess its current SWPPP and certify via SMARTS any additional BMPs identified which are necessary in order to meet the Receiving Water Limitations.

American Custom Marble, Inc. may have had other violations that can only be fully identified and documented once discovery and investigation have been completed. Hence, to the extent possible, EDEN includes such violations in this Notice and reserves the right to amend this Notice, if necessary, to include such further violations in future legal proceedings.

The violations discussed herein are derived from eye witness reports and records publicly available. These violations are continuing.

IV. THE PERSON OR PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE VIOLATIONS

The entities responsible for the alleged violations are American Custom Marble, Inc., as well as employees of the Facility responsible for compliance with the CWA.

V. THE DATE, DATES, OR REASONABLE RANGE OF DATES OF THE VIOLATIONS

The range of dates covered by this 60-day Notice is from at least July 1, 2015, to the date of this Notice. EDEN may from time to time update this Notice to include all violations which may occur after the range of dates covered by this Notice. Some of the violations are continuous in nature; therefore, each day constitutes a violation.

VI. CONTACT INFORMATION

The entity giving this 60-day Notice is Eden Environmental Citizen's Group ("EDEN").

Aiden Sanchez
EDEN ENVIRONMENTAL CITIZEN'S GROUP
2151 Salvio Street #A2-319
Concord, CA 94520
Telephone: (925) 732-0960
Email: Edenenvcitizens@gmail.com (emailed correspondence is preferred)
Website: edenenvironmental.org

EDEN has retained counsel in this matter as follows:

XHAVIN SINHA
Sinha Law
1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
San Jose, CA 95125
Telephone: (408) 791-0432
Email: xsinha@sinha-law.com

To ensure proper response to this Notice, all communications should be addressed to EDEN's legal counsel, Mr. Xhavin Sinha.

VII. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

As discussed herein, the Facility's discharge of pollutants degrades water quality and harms aquatic life in the Receiving Waters. Members of EDEN live, work, and/or recreate near the Receiving Waters. For example, EDEN members use and enjoy the Receiving Waters for fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, biking, bird watching, picnicking, viewing wildlife, and/or engaging in scientific study. The unlawful discharge of pollutants from the Facility impairs each of these uses.

Further, the Facility's discharges of polluted storm water and non-storm water are ongoing and continuous. As a result, the interests of EDEN's members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by the failure of the Discharger to comply with the General Permit and the Clean Water Act.

CWA §§ 505(a)(1) and 505(f) provide for citizen enforcement actions against any "person," including individuals, corporations, or partnerships, for violations of NPDES permit requirements and for un-permitted discharges of pollutants. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a)(1) and (f), §1362(5).

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five (5) years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009, and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.

In addition to civil penalties, EDEN will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law. Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d), EDEN will seek to recover its litigation costs, including attorneys' and experts' fees.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The CWA specifically provides a 60-day notice period to promote resolution of disputes. EDEN encourages the Discharger's counsel to contact EDEN's counsel within 20 days of receipt of this Notice to initiate a discussion regarding the violations detailed herein.

During the 60-day notice period, EDEN is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations; however, if the Discharger wishes to pursue such discussions in the absence of litigation, it is suggested those discussions be initiated soon so that they may be completed before the end of the 60-day notice period. EDEN reserves the right to file a lawsuit if discussions are continuing when the notice period ends.

Very truly yours,



AIDEN SANCHEZ

Eden Environmental Citizen's Group

Copies to:

Andrew Wheeler: Wheeler.andrew@Epa.gov
Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

State Water Resources Control Board
Attn: Mayumi Okamoto, Office of Enforcement: Mayumi.Okamoto@waterboards.ca.gov
stormwater@waterboards.ca.gov

Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA – Region 9
Attn: Jennifer Pierce: pierce.jennifer@epa.gov
Laurie Kermish: Kermish.Laurie@epa.gov